



#6  
10/22/03  
T.M.

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventors:	Jean-Christophe J. Kling		
Serial No.:	10/099,775	Examiner:	S. Varner
Filed:	December 31, 1999	Group Art Unit:	3635
Title:	Architectural System Using a Retractable Strut Aligned in a Base Plane and an Extension Strut Protruding Acutely from the Base Plane		
Docket No.:	02-001		

Box Non-Fee Amendment  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed May 2, 2003, please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 14 2003  
**GROUP 3600**

In the Office action mailed on 2 May 2003, claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Richter (U.S. Patent 5,704,169). One of the elements in that claim recites "means for assembling ... first, second and third rigid struts." The PTO must construe functional limitations in accordance with the corresponding structure disclosed in the specification when examining means-plus-function patent claims. In re Donaldson, 29 U.S.P.Q.2d 1845 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (en banc). Neither Applicant's disclosed structure nor any equivalent is taught or suggested by Richter. Accordingly, allowance is respectfully requested.

Concerning the allowance of claims 1, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's reasoning leaves some room for interpretation. Applicant notes that claim 1 does not